

REMARKS

In the June 11, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-18 and 21-24 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the June 11, 2007 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 12, 13, and 21, canceled claim 4, and added claim 25 as indicated above. Thus, claims 1-3, 5-18, and 21-24 are pending, with claims 1, 12, 21, and 25 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In pages 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 12, 13, 15, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,527,372 (Choi et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003-01935339 (Umetani et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,843,548 (Arakawa et al.). In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 2, 12, 13, and 21 as mentioned above.

More specifically, independent claims 1, 12, and 21 now recite that a physical property value acquisition section is configured and arranged to acquire physical property values of the droplets discharged from the discharge head, and to acquire at least one of viscosity, surface tension, contact angle, and density as the physical property values of the droplets. In pages 6-7 of the Office Action, U.S. Patent No. 4,908,635 (Iwasawa et al.) was cited to show that Iwasawa et al. disclose the physical property value acquisition section. However, Iwasawa et al. disclose determining a recoding density at every ink nozzle, not density of droplets, of the multi-nozzle type ink jet printing head. Applicants respectfully assert that this arrangement is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Choi et al., Umetani et al.,

Arakawa et al. or any other prior art of record. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art *suggests* the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of the drive waveform-determining device, the droplet discharge device, or the droplet discharge method.

It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art provides an *apparent reason* for the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of the drive waveform-determining device, the droplet discharge device, or the droplet discharge method.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 2-3 and 5-11, are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Applicants believe that the dependent claims 13-18 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 12 and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Applicants believe that the dependent claims 22-24 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 21, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Further, the dependent claims 2-3, 5-11, 13-18, and 22-24 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, 12, or 21, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Appl. No. 10/783,094
Amendment dated September 10, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 11, 2007

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

New Claim

Applicants have added claim 25 reciting a drive waveform-determining device. Applicants respectfully assert that claim 25 is similar to claim 1, and is allowable for the same reason mentioned above. Applicants respectfully assert that claim 25 is further allowable because claim 25 is narrower than claim 1.

Examination of claim 25 is respectfully requested.


Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-3, 5-18, and 21-25 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Todd M. Guise
Reg. No. 46,748

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: 9/10/07

S:\09-SEP07-AO\SE-US035203 Amendment.doc